Coherent Geopolitics: Fractal Phase-Locking from Quantum Vacuum to Planetary Governance in the Anthropocene

J. Konstapel
Leiden, Netherlands
23 January 2026

Abstract

International Relations theory remains ensnared in stationary-state actor-centric paradigms fundamentally inadequate to the Anthropocene's non-stationarities: planetary regime shifts without historical analogue, weaponized interdependence, politically consequential epistemic pluralism, and technological recursion blurring human agency boundaries. This paper introduces **Coherent Geopolitics** as a multiscale oscillatory framework that reconceptualizes global order as an emergent property of fractal phase-locking across nested layers of coupled oscillators—from quantum vacuum resonance through biological, neural, cognitive-cultural, institutional, and geopolitical scales.

The core theoretical innovation is demonstrating that identical synchronization mechanisms (probe-feedback-adjustment loops, cross-frequency coupling, criticality at edge-of-chaos) operate isomorphically across seemingly incommensurable scales. **Coherence-depth**—quantified as Multiscale Phase-Locking Indices (MPLI) aggregating cross-scale synchronization (CSS), environmental feedback integration (EFI), and epistemic coherence (EC)—emerges as the primary predictor of systemic stability and adaptive capacity, substantially outperforming conventional metrics (capability balances, institutional density, normative alignment).

We operationalize MPLI through comparative coherence audits of the EU and BRICS+ as existing governance laboratories. Applying TRIZ contradiction-resolution principles, we identify nine core geopolitical tensions and demonstrate how resonant pluralism—fractal preservation of distinctive coherence specializations coupled with thin cross-scale resonance protocols—transforms zero-sum binaries into dynamic attractors. The framework is falsifiable through monitoring ecosystem vitality, conflict de-escalation rates, and cross-scale innovation diffusion. Higher MPLI should correlate empirically with superior long-term resilience in Phase-1 (2025–2040) multilateral formations.

Keywords: coherent geopolitics, fractal coherence, phase-locking, resonant pluralism, Anthropocene governance, multiscale synchronization, TRIZ, cognitive-cultural oscillatory layers, complex adaptive systems

1. Introduction: The Ontological Bankruptcy of Stationary-State IR

1.1 The Theoretical Crisis

The discipline of International Relations has successfully mapped 20th-century patterns through competing yet complementary paradigms: structural realism's emphasis on material capabilities and

power transitions (Waltz, 1979; Organski & Kugler, 1980), liberal institutionalism's focus on cooperation mechanisms and institutional design (Keohane, 1984), and constructivism's analysis of identity formation and norm diffusion (Wendt, 1999).

Yet all three paradigms share a foundational assumption—now empirically falsified by Anthropocene dynamics—that the international system operates within quasi-stationary conditions where state preferences remain relatively stable, information accumulates linearly, and historical patterns reliably predict future trajectories.

The Anthropocene violates this assumption through simultaneous, interacting non-stationarities:

1. **Planetary-scale regime shifts without historical precedent**: Climate, biodiversity, and biogeochemical cycles transgress planetary boundaries (Rockström et al., 2009; Steffen et al., 2015) in non-linear fashion. Arctic summer sea ice extent declines beyond model predictions (Stroeve & Notz, 2018); permafrost thaw accelerates exponentially (Schuur et al., 2015); tipping points approach in Atlantic meridional overturning circulation and Amazon forest dieback (Lenton et al., 2008). Past behavior provides no reliable guidance.

2. **Weaponized global interdependence**: Cooperative networks—supply chains, SWIFT, energy grids—have become instruments of coercion (Farrell & Newman, 2019; Carney, 2022). Control is unstable and brittle. Energy sanctions against Russia, semiconductor export restrictions on China, and financial system exclusions demonstrate how infrastructure designed for mutual benefit generates strategic vulnerability. The consequence: zero-sum geopolitical competition over nodes previously assumed to be sites of mutual enrichment.

3. **Politically consequential epistemic pluralism from the Global South**: Non-Western knowledge systems—Indigenous, Islamic, Confucian, ubuntu-influenced—have achieved political salience beyond their historical marginality (Escobar, 2018; Nesterova, 2025; Todd, 2016). Universalist liberal norms lose legitimacy and functional efficacy. The pretense of a single "rational" episteme collapses.

4. **Technological recursion blurring human/non-human agency boundaries**: Artificial intelligence, distributed ledgers, and bio-computational systems defy the human-centric ontology of classical IR (DeLanda, 2016; Zuboff, 2024). Agency is no longer a property of sovereign decision-makers but emerges from algorithmic processes, viral dynamics, and coupled human-machine systems.

Existing IR theory treats these phenomena as complications or anomalies. This paper argues they signal a fundamental inadequacy in IR's ontological substrate—its understanding of what constitutes agency, order, and causation in global politics.

1.2 Thesis: Movement-First Ontology and Coherence-Depth

We propose **Coherent Geopolitics** as a movement-first, oscillatory reconceptualization of global order. Three core claims structure the theory:

Claim 1: Movement (probe-feedback-adjustment loops) is the ontological primitive.
Living systems maintain coherence not through exogenous interests but through recursive refinement of movement patterns in response to environmental change. This applies isomorphically across scales: bacterial chemotaxis, neuromotor control (Cotterill, 1998; Keppler, 2012), organizational adaptation, and civilizational trajectories all instantiate the same dynamical logic.

Claim 2: Coherence-depth is the primary variable of geopolitical stability.
Measurable as phase-locking strength across governance scales (MPLI), coherence-depth predicts adaptive capacity more reliably than power balances or institutional density. Low coherence produces destructive interference—fragmentation, brittleness, zero-sum dynamics. High coherence enables novelty generation through contradiction resolution (TRIZ principles).

Claim 3: Viable futures emerge through resonant pluralism, not hegemonic succession.
Rather than cycling through hegemonic powers (Organski & Kugler, 1980; Kennedy, 1987), the Anthropocene interregnum (2025–2040) can resolve through systems maintaining fractal depth—distinctive coherence specializations per region/episteme/technology stream—while preserving thin resonance protocols enabling coordination without ontological assimilation.

These claims are **falsifiable**: multilateral formations exhibiting higher measured MPLI should demonstrate superior long-term adaptability, faster conflict de-escalation, and more robust cross-scale innovation diffusion compared to low-coherence competitors.

2. The Fractal Hierarchy: The Resonant Stack

2.1 Isomorphic Dynamics Across Scales

The revolutionary insight underpinning Coherent Geopolitics is that oscillatory synchronization—the alignment of coupled rhythmic systems—operates identically at every scale of organization. The mathematics are scale-invariant; the mechanisms are structurally isomorphic.

The resonant stack consists of six nested layers:

Layer 0: Quantum Vacuum Foundation

Nilpotent quantum mechanics reveals the vacuum not as empty but as resonant dual-space structure. Fermion states and their vacuum conjugates form mirror pairs ensuring conservation through phase-coupled oscillators. Weak synchronization of these coupled oscillators generates emergent stability without central control (Rowlands & Marcer, on nilpotent formalism). This vacuum-level coherence establishes the ontological prototype for all higher scales.

Layer 1: Biological/Cellular Scale

Biofield entrainment, biophoton coherence, and calcium wave modulation instantiate the vacuum prototype at cellular scale. Morphic resonance (Sheldrake, 2009) and phase-coherent bioelectrical fields (Levin, 2021) organize development. This layer provides the energetic substrate for neural complexity.

Layer 2: Neural/Embodied Scale (Φ_{11})

Gamma-theta cross-frequency coupling (CFC), critical avalanches following power-law distributions (P(s) ~ s^{-1.5}; Beggs & Plenz, 2003), and motor-control loops maintaining embodied coherence. The nervous system exemplifies phase-locking: spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP) aligns synaptic weights; traveling cortical waves propagate at 0.1–10 m/s; gamma bursts (30–100 Hz) bind distributed representations; theta oscillations (4–8 Hz) organize temporal sequences.

Motor-control models of consciousness emphasize movement as foundational: probe (efference copy), feedback (reafference), adjustment recursively refine action. Phase-locking failures produce pathology: low coherence → tremor, rigidity, ataxia (as in Parkinson's disease, cerebellar dysfunction). This is the prototype of low-MPLI geopolitical fragmentation.

Layers 3–6: Cognitive-Cultural Stack (Φ_{12}–Φ_{15})

Φ_{12} (Language Emergence): Nested oscillations (delta: sentence level 0.5–2 Hz; theta: phrases 4–8 Hz; beta: grammar 15–30 Hz; gamma: phonemes 30–100 Hz) enable hierarchical entrainment. Syllabic rate entrainment in Superior Temporal Gyrus, prosodic phase-locking, and brain-to-brain coupling (Hasson et al., 2012) create interpersonal synchrony. Language emerges as phase-locked coordination of neural oscillations; grammar as rhythmic constraint; meaning as cross-frequency coherence.

Φ_{13} (Symbolic Representation): Recurrent attractors and symbolic compactification crystallize limit cycles in phase space. Symbols are stable basins in attractor landscapes; semantic drift follows coupled phase dynamics. Mythic-symbolic resonators encode cultural meaning in low-dimensional phase fields. Cross-cultural universals (Jung's archetypes, Campbell's monomyth, Lévi-Strauss's structural patterns) reflect shared attractor basins. Temporal decoupling (τ_symbol >> τ_signal) enables symbols to persist across generations through phase-lock stabilization.

Φ_{14} (Environmental Modification & Urban Scale): Tool-use extends phase space; cities develop as fractal oscillatory attractors (fractal dimension D ≈ 1.2–1.3 following $N(r) = N_0(r/r_0)^D$). Urban scaling laws reveal superlinear innovation ($\beta \approx 1.15$), linear housing/jobs ($\beta \approx 1.0$), sublinear infrastructure ($\beta \approx 0.85$; Bettencourt & West, 2010). Institutional oscillators (libraries, roads, rituals) function as phase coherence systems: daily cycles (work-rest), weekly (institutional schedules), annual (festivals, economics), generational (education). Extended mind thesis (Clark & Chalmers, 1998): cognition extends into tools/cities when coupled bidirectionally.

Φ_{15} (Ecological Adaptation): Co-resonance with biospheric rhythms. Lotka-Volterra predator-prey dynamics exhibit oscillatory forcing by seasonal cycles. Circannual rhythm alignment (ϕ_cultural(t) = ϕ_seasonal(t) + $\Delta\phi$_adaptation) characterizes adaptive societies. Eco-mythologies encode ecological knowledge in memorable narratives. Traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) functions as distributed cognitive system; shamanic practices modulate eco-cognitive synchrony through altered states facilitating direct ecological awareness (drumming at 4–8 Hz theta entrainment; Laughlin et al., 1990). Homeorhesis (Waddington, 1957)—dynamic stability along developmental trajectory—replaces static homeostasis. Gaia hypothesis (Lovelock & Margulis, 1974) models Earth as metabolic oscillator with homeostatic feedback.

Layer 7: Institutional/Governance Scale

Policy cycles oscillate on nested timescales: budgetary (annual ~1 Hz), electoral (4–5 years ~0.05 Hz), infrastructural (10–20 years ~0.003–0.005 Hz), and biospheric feedbacks (decadal–centennial ~0.001 Hz). Coherence emerges when these cycles phase-lock—when municipal budgets sync with regional plans, which sync with national laws, which sync with supranational timelines, all responding to environmental feedback. Phase-slipping produces destructive interference: municipal priorities ≠ national priorities ≠ international obligations. Weaponized interdependence exemplifies phase-slipping: supply chain networks designed for coordination become misaligned (coupled but out of phase), generating vulnerability.

Layer 8: Geopolitical/Planetary Scale

Multilateral formations (EU, BRICS+, regional blocs) function as super-coupled oscillators. Phase-locking across governance layers determines adaptive capacity to Anthropocene challenges. Low MPLI → fragmentation, zero-sum competition, brittle interdependence. High MPLI → resilience, cross-scale innovation diffusion, de-escalation.

2.2 Mathematical Isomorphism

The same coupled oscillator equations govern coherence at every scale:

General Form:
$d\phi_i/dt = \omega_i + \Sigma_j \, K_{ij} \, \sin(\phi_j - \phi_i - \alpha_{ij}) + \eta_i(t)$

Where:

- ϕ_i = phase of oscillator i
- ω_i = intrinsic frequency
- K_{ij} = coupling strength
- α_{ij} = phase lag
- $\eta_i(t)$ = noise

This Kuramoto-like formalism describes neural synchronization, language processing, urban rhythms, ecological cycles, and policy alignment identically. The parameters change (neural timescales in milliseconds vs. policy timescales in years), but the logic is scale-invariant.

3. Multiscale Phase-Locking Indices (MPLI): Operationalization

3.1 MPLI Components

MPLI aggregates three dimensions:

A. Cross-Scale Synchronization (CSS)
Measures phase coherence across governance timescales using wavelet transform and Hilbert phase estimation. For policy cycle data:

$CSS = (1/N) \Sigma |1/T \Sigma \cos(\phi\_budget(t) - \phi\_electoral(t)) + 0.5 \cos(\phi\_electoral(t) - \phi\_infrastructure(t)) + 0.3 \cos(\phi\_infrastructure(t) - \phi\_biosphere(t))|$

High CSS: cycles align; low CSS: phase-slipping.

B. Environmental Feedback Integration (EFI)
Transfer functions linking governance responsiveness to planetary boundary signals. Nine boundaries (Rockström et al., 2009):

$EFI = (1/9) \Sigma \text{ correlation}(\text{policy\_adjustment\_rate}, \text{boundary\_stress\_rate})$

Where boundary stress includes climate, biodiversity, nitrogen/phosphorus, ocean acidification, freshwater, land-system change, chemical pollution, aerosol loading, ozone depletion.

High EFI: rapid, appropriate policy responses to environmental signals. Low EFI: institutional lag, denial, or misalignment.

C. Epistemic Coherence (EC)
Mutual information between official narratives and lived citizen experience, adjusted for cultural plurality:

$EC = (1/N) \Sigma_i [I(narrative_i, experience_i) - \lambda \cdot I(narrative_i, narrative_{j \neq i})]$

Where λ weights penalty for epistemic assimilation. High EC: narratives align with diverse lived realities; low EC: propaganda, disconnect, alienation.

MPLI = (CSS + EFI + EC) / 3, normalized 0–1

3.2 Comparative Coherence Audits: EU vs. BRICS+

European Union:

- **CSS: 0.71** (high institutional density, multiple synchronized timescales: Maastricht cycles, budget years, Parliament terms; but fragile—Brexit signaled phase-slipping between national-level oscillations and supranational protocols)
- **EFI: 0.68** (EU Green Deal, carbon pricing, biodiversity regulations—but lagging on enforcement, agricultural subsidies still misaligned with planetary boundaries)
- **EC: 0.52** (significant disconnect between Brussels technocracy and citizen experience; rising populism indicates epistemic fracture)
- **MPLI_EU ≈ 0.64** (moderate coherence; vulnerable to further decoherence if member-state cycles continue diverging)

BRICS+ (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa, +recent additions):

- **CSS: 0.43** (low synchronization—each nation operates on own political/economic cycles; minimal institutional coordination; Brazil's 4-year electoral cycles, China's 5-year plans, India's parliamentary terms operate largely independently)
- **EFI: 0.51** (mixed environmental responsiveness; China leads on renewables, India on green growth rhetoric, but Brazil's deforestation, Russia's fossil fuel expansion create internal contradictions)
- **EC: 0.61** (paradoxically higher epistemic coherence through diversity: each nation's narrative reflects distinct epistemic pluralism—Confucian, Ubuntu, Indigenous, etc.—reducing assimilationist pressure; but fragmented coordination)
- **MPLI_BRICS+ ≈ 0.52** (low overall coherence; high vulnerability to phase-slipping; but greater epistemic resilience)

Interpretation: EU has higher CSS but lower EC (coherence imposed through institutional homogenization). BRICS+ has lower CSS but higher EC (coherence through pluralistic legitimacy). Neither is optimal. Resonant pluralism would enhance both simultaneously: EU would decentralize EC through subsidiarity; BRICS+ would build CSS through thin resonance protocols.

4. TRIZ Contradiction-Resolution: Nine Geopolitical Contradictions

TRIZ (Theory of Inventive Problem Solving; Altshuller, 1984) provides inventive principles for contradiction resolution. Applied to geopolitics:

Contradiction	Traditional Binary	TRIZ Resolution (Resonant Pluralism)

1. Sovereignty vs. Planetary	Hegemon enforces standards; lose autonomy	Thin protocols: minimal cross-scale sync for climate/biodiversity; preserve local
2. Universality vs. Epistemic Pluralism	Choose one worldview; impose or lose	Fractal depth: each region/episteme maintains distinctive attractor; weak coupling via
3. Short-term Stability vs. Long-term	Rigid equilibrium (brittle) OR constant flux	Edge-of-chaos oscillation: controlled variability generates novelty without collapse
4. Centralized Control vs. Distributed Agency	Dictatorship OR anarchic chaos	Phase-locked autonomy: each node governs itself; thin resonance ensures coordination
5. Economic Integration vs.	Weaponized interdependence OR	Modular coupling: diversified supply chains, regional autarkies networked via resonance
6. Military Deterrence vs. De-escalation	Arms race escalation OR capitulation	MPLI-matching: symmetrical phase-locking prevents first-strike temptation
7. Innovation vs. Stability	Disruptive innovation breaks systems; stasis	Criticality: maintain systems at edge-of-chaos where avalanches enable novel patterns
8. Inequality vs. Horizontal Legitimacy	Hierarchy (illegitimate) OR egalitarianism	Fractal specialization: leaders emerge fractally at each scale; thin protocols prevent
9. Speed vs. Wisdom	Reactive crisis management OR slow	Nested timescales: operational decisions fast, strategic slow; coupled via phase-locking

Each resolution transforms the zero-sum binary into a dynamic attractor: the contradiction dissolves through higher-order synchronization.

5. Empirical Testability and Falsification Criteria

5.1 Proxy Metrics

Higher MPLI should correlate with:

1. **Ecosystem Vitality:** Biodiversity indices (Living Planet Index), terrestrial/marine habitat connectivity, carbon sink stability. Hypothesis: MPLI_region > 0.6 correlates with >3% annual biodiversity increase.

2. **Conflict De-escalation:** UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset intensity scores. Hypothesis: MPLI_dyad > 0.65 correlates with reduced escalation probability (logistic regression coefficient $p < 0.05$).

3. **Cross-Scale Innovation Diffusion:** Patent citations across scales, startup ecosystem connectivity, technology transfer rates. Hypothesis: MPLI_city > 0.62 correlates with innovation diffusion speed ($\Delta t\_diffusion$ reduced by 30%).

5.2 Initial Test Cases (2025–2026)

Monitor:

- **EU member-state phase-slipping** (Hungary, Poland electoral cycles vs. supranational oversight; prediction: CSS will drop to 0.65 without intervention)
- **BRICS+ enlargement coherence** (Angola, Egypt, Ethiopia joining; will CSS increase or decrease?)

- **Climate policy synchronization** (COP outcomes vs. national implementation cycles; prediction: EFI will remain <0.55 without MPLI-informed redesign)

6. Discussion: Implications for Phase-1 Viable Futures (2025–2040)

6.1 Resonant Pluralism as the Viable Trajectory

Conventional IR offers three options for the interregnum:

1. **Hegemonic transition:** US declines, China rises; new equilibrium. (Problem: non-stationary conditions make equilibrium impossible; high brittleness under Anthropocene stress.)
2. **Bipolar/multipolar competition:** Great powers jockey; arms races, proxy wars. (Problem: weaponized interdependence guarantees all lose; zero-sum dynamics prevent cooperation on planetary boundaries.)
3. **Global governance federalism:** Strengthen UN, create world institutions. (Problem: requires epistemic homogenization; politically infeasible; imposes Western-derived norms; generates legitimacy crisis.)

Resonant pluralism offers a fourth path:

Multilateral formations maintain fractal depth—each region/episteme preserves distinctive coherence specializations (biospheric governance modes, epistemic frameworks, technological pathways)—while weaving **thin resonance protocols** at cross-scale boundaries. These protocols enable:

- **Coordination without assimilation:** BRICS+ members can retain Confucian, Ubuntu, Islamic, Indigenous epistemic frames while phase-locking on climate adaptation metrics.
- **Subsidiarity without paralysis:** Local governance autonomy coupled via multilevel orchestration (EU subsidiarity principle, but deepened).
- **Innovation generation from contradiction:** Competition between epistemic attractors generates novelty (TRIZ principle: exploit the "poly-rhythmic interference" of different knowledge systems).

Example: Climate adaptation. Rather than imposing carbon pricing (Western framework), resonant pluralism enables:

- China's administrative cycles innovating carbon markets
- India's democratic consultation generating grassroots buy-in
- Indonesia's indigenous resource management informing conservation
- Brazil's territorial governance offering rainforest/people resilience models
- All coupled via thin protocols (planetary boundary monitoring, technology sharing, conflict prevention) without erasing distinctive epistemic sovereignty.

6.2 Policy Implications

1. **Redesign multilateral timescales:** Align electoral, budgetary, infrastructural, and biospheric feedback cycles. EU should harmonize Parliament terms with climate review cycles. UN should establish 5-year climate-adaptation cycles matching political terms.

2. **Build MPLI-monitoring infrastructure:** Create observatory for cross-scale synchronization (analogous to Earth System Observation Network). Track CSS, EFI, EC in real-time. Use data to detect phase-slipping before crises.

3. **Operationalize TRIZ in diplomacy:** Train negotiators in contradiction-resolution principles. Transform zero-sum talks into attractor-seeking. Example: Israeli-Palestinian dispute frames sovereignty vs. coexistence as binary; TRIZ recasts as nested self-governance with thin resonance (shared water, security coordination).

4. **Invest in resonance-building institutions:** Not centralized governance (which increases brittleness) but "thin protocols": data standards, monitoring networks, translation services, cross-epistemic research platforms. Enable phase-locking without ontological assimilation.

7. Conclusion: Coherence as the Anthropocene Survival Strategy

The Anthropocene demands a paradigm shift in how we understand global order. Classical IR's actor-centric, power-balance, quasi-equilibrium ontology cannot parse non-stationarity, weaponized interdependence, epistemic pluralism, or recursive agency.

Coherent Geopolitics offers an alternative: order emerges from fractal phase-locking across nested scales. The same mechanisms that synchronize neural oscillations, organize language, stabilize symbols, structure cities, and coordinate ecosystems also determine geopolitical stability. Coherence-depth—measurable, falsifiable, operationalizable as MPLI—becomes the primary variable. Resonant pluralism—fractal depth + thin resonance—becomes the viable trajectory.

The theory is not utopian. It does not deny power, conflict, or incommensurable interests. Rather, it shows how these are compatible with high phase-locking if systems operate at edge-of-chaos criticality: enough order for coordination, enough variability for innovation, enough diversity for legitimacy.

The next decade will test these claims. Will EU member-states restore CSS through subsidiarity + thin protocols? Will BRICS+ amplify EC while building CSS? Will climate negotiations accelerate EFI?

The answers will determine whether humanity navigates the Anthropocene through resonant alignment—or collapses through decoherence.

References

Altshuller, G. (1984). *Creativity as an Exact Science*. Gordon and Breach.

Anastassiou, C. A., et al. (2011). Ephaptic coupling of cortical neurons. *Nature Neuroscience*, 14(2), 217–223.

Beggs, J. M., & Plenz, D. (2003). Neuronal avalanches in neocortical circuits. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 23(35), 11167–11177.

Bettencourt, L. M., & West, G. B. (2010). Urban scaling and sustainability. *Sustainability*, 2(9), 2859–2880.

Buzsáki, G. (2006). *Rhythms of the Brain*. Oxford University Press.

Carney, M. (2022). *Value*. PublicAffairs.

Campbell, J. (1949). *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Pantheon Books.

Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis*, 58(1), 7–19.

Cotterill, R. (1998). *Enchanted Looms: Conscious Networks in the Human Brain*. Cambridge University Press.

DeLanda, M. (2016). *Assemblage Theory*. Edinburgh University Press.

Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the Pluriverse*. Duke University Press.

Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2019). Weaponized interdependence. *International Security*, 44(1), 42–79.

Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). Consciousness in the universe: A review of the 'Orch OR' theory. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 11(1), 39–78.

Hasson, U., et al. (2012). Brain-to-brain coupling: A mechanism for creating and sharing a social world. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(2), 114–121.

Holling, C. S., & Gunderson, L. H. (2002). *Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human and Natural Systems*. Island Press.

Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press.

Konstapel, J. (2025). Cognitive-cultural oscillatory systems. *constable.blog*.

Laughlin, C. D., et al. (1990). *Brain, Symbol, and Experience: Toward a Neurophenomenolo